Remarks

Examiner Interview Summary

The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Wu for the courtesies extended in electronic mail correspondence on September 20, 2008 and September 21, 2008. In the correspondence the examiner suggested amendments to the claims for advancing the prosecution and the applicants indicated that they would consider the suggestions and prepare an amendment and response for consideration.

Art Rejections

The applicants have carefully considered the Office action mailed March 20, 2008 and the Advisory Action mailed September 8, 2008. By way of the forgoing amendments, claims 1, 2, 7-9, 14, 16, 21-23, and 27 have been amended and claims 3, 6, 10, 13, 17-18, 25, 26 have been cancelled. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, the applicants note that the recitations of dependent claims have been added to the independent claims. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations of claims 3 and 6, claim 8 has been amended to include the recitations of claims 8, 10 and 13, claim 16 has been amended to include the recitations of claims 17 and 18, and claim 23 has been amended to include the recitations of claims 25 and 26.

Claim 1 was rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 by Brumme (US Pub. No. 2005/0172286). Claim 1 recites a method comprising, *inter alia*, generating a processor instruction proxy stub based on one or more processor instructions not supported by a managed runtime environment during installation of a managed runtime application and inserting a processor instruction proxy stub into a managed application program interface

associated with a managed runtime environment to generate an optimized managed application program interface supporting the one or more processor instructions. As explained in detail in the applicants' response dated May 20, 2008, Brumme does not describe or suggest generating a processor instruction proxy stub or inserting a processor instruction proxy stub into a managed application program interface. The Advisory Action dated September 8, 2008, argued that updates and modifications allegedly taught in Brumme would include updating code and compiling. Even if such contentions are true, a point that the applicants do not concede, Brumme fails to describe or suggest generating a processor instruction proxy stub during installation of a managed runtime application. There is no suggestion that updating and compiling as described in the Advisory Action would have occurred during installation of the managed runtime application. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Further, for at least the reasons described in conjunction with claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8, 16, and 23 and all claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

The applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof are respectfully requested. If there is any matter that the examiner would like to discuss, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC
150 S. Wacker Dr.
Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dated: **September 22, 2008**

/Michael W. Zimmerman/

Michael W. Zimmerman
Reg. No. 57,993
Agent for Applicants
312.580.1020